

Remarks/Arguments:

This Amendment is provided to add new claim 28, cancel claims 8-10, 13-19 and 21-27, and amend claims 1, 6, 7 and 20. No new matter has been added. Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-7, 11, 12, 20 and 28 will be pending. Claims 1, 20 and 28 are independent.

Election/Restriction

The Examiner has required an election under 35 U.S.C. §121 of one of the following alleged species: (I) species of Figures 1-7, (II) species of Figures 8A-8F, and (III) species of Figures 9A-12C. The Applicants believe that Figure 8C, including the leaf spring 52, should be included in species (I), such that, the alleged species are correctly described as: (I) species of Figures 1-7 and 8C, (II) species of Figures 8A-8B and 8D-8F, and (III) species of Figures 9A-12C.

Confirming the Applicants' telephone election, the Applicants elect species (I) of Figures 1-7. Claims 1-7, 11, 12, 15, 18-20 and new claim 28 are readable on the elected species.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner is thanked for the allowable subject matter of claims 15 and 20. Specifically, the Examiner has stated that claim 20 is allowed, and claim 15 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. By this Amendment, the Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to include the limitations of claim 15, and claim 15 has been cancelled.

However, in view of the claims allowed in the parent application, now U.S. Patent No. 7,022,128, the recitation of an "enlarged" distal end of the moveable guard has been deleted from independent claims 1 and 20, and from dependent claims 6 and 7, since it is not required for patentability with the claims as presently written.

Application No. 10/828,501
Amendment dated October 4, 2007
Reply to final Office Action of June 4, 2007

Further, the Applicants have added new claim 28 which recites the limitations of independent claim 20 as amended, with the exception of the limitation of "substantially cylindrical" in lines 3-4, and "cylindrical" in lines 5 in regard to the housing of the handle body.

Accordingly, the Applicants believe that claims 1-7, 11, 12, 20 and 28 are now in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

In view of the above, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance and notice to this effect is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Ronald S. Grubb
Ronald S. Grubb
Reg. No. 48,672
Attorney for Applicants

Dated: October 4, 2007

Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P.
1300 19th Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20036
T: (202) 659-9076